

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings, objected to the disclosure, objected to claim 1 as informal, rejected claims 1, 2, and 5 - 9 as anticipated by the Haines et al. reference, indicated that the subject matter of claims 3 and 4 is allowable, and cited additional references of record without being relied upon.

Drawing Objection

A set of replacement drawings is attached to address the Examiner's objection. The drawings provide improved line quality over the drawings as filed. In addition, Figure 3 is provided with a reference character "1" to indicate the printer, which is referenced repeatedly in the specification, as noted by the Examiner. A second reference character "17" is added to indicate the second output as described in the specification. No new matter is added by these changes.

Disclosure Objection

The specification as been amended as required by the Examiner. The objections to reference character "1" are addressed by an amendment to the drawing Figure 3. The objection to the reference character "17" is addressed by addition of a second "17" in the drawing figure 17 to indicate the second output channel in the drawing, as described in the specification. No new matter is added by these changes.

Informal Claim

Claim 1 is cancelled without prejudice, so the objection is moot. The text of claim 1 that has been incorporated into claims 3 and 4 has been revised so as not to repeat the objectionable word.

35 USC 102(b)

The rejected claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled without prejudice. The remaining claims are amended to depend directly or indirectly from allowable claims 3 or 4, with the exception of claim 9 that is amended to incorporate a limitation to distinguish over the art of record.

Allowable Claims

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3 and 4. These claims are redrafted in independent form and the claims 5 - 8 are amended to depend either directly or indirectly therefrom.

Additional Art

The additional art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon is noted by the Applicants.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing.

Respectfully submitted,



Melvin A. Robinson (Reg. No. 31,870)

Schiff Hardin LLP

Patent Department


6600 Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: 312-258-5785

CUSTOMER NO. 26574

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on February 18, 2005.

CHI\4230255.1

IN THE DRAWINGS

A set of replacement drawings is attached hereto. A marked up copy of Figure 3 is also enclosed to indicate the two new reference characters that have been added. No new matter is added by these changes.

MARKED UP COPY TO SHOW CHANGES




FIG. 3